50% shareholding by the sector shareholders which would include 26% equity by NTPG.

Bftwer projects inviuting cicamncc

†4067. SHRIC0FALSINHG. SOIIANKI: Will thaMnisterof PO^VER be pleased to state :

(a) whether staac new power pcgects of private sector are presently pending with Goveraaient fotrclearance;

(b) the details of costs and power generation of capacities oF various projects to be set up-in Karnataka, Gujarat and various other States;

(c) whether eoncemed Stats Governments have already provided various local; infrastrucfiiral facilities for the said projects; and

(d) the narases of industrkil houses who have sent tlie proposals to set up the power prefects in tht said States ?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF POWER (SHRIMATI JAY A WANTI MEHTA) : (a) to (d) Details of the schemes for setting up fower projects in the private sector in the country for which the Detailed Pisyect Reports have been received in Central Electricity Authority (CEA) for tcchno-cconomic clearance, indicating their estimated completed costs, the project promoters, capacity and thepending inputs/clearanccs/linkages are given below:—

S. No.	Name of the project/ Promoters/ State	Capacity (MW)	Estimated completed cost (Rs. in crores)	Pending inputs
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
I.	Dhamwari Sunda HEP (M/s Dhamwari Power Company Ltd.) Himachal Pradesh	70	563.03	(i) Tentative financial package (ii) Forest clearance for transmission lines. (iii) Power evacuation beyond Maliana Sub-station

†Original notice of the question was received iii Hindi.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
				(iv) Furnishing of clarifications to the observations made in the meeting of the Standing Project Appraisal Committee of Central Electricity Authority held on March 13, 2000.
2.	ShrinagarHEP (M/s Duncans North Hydro-Power Co. Ltd.) Uttar Pradesh	330	1252.48	The techno-economic clearance gi\'en to the project earlier as the State sector project was transferred in favour of promoters on November 26,2000. The project was considered by SPAC for techno-economic clearance on April 27, 2000, The promoters are required to furnish additional infor-mation whereafter the project will be taken up for techno-economic appraisal.
3.	JawaharpurTPP (M/s Jawaharpur Power India Ltd.) Uttar Pradesh	800	3810.14	(i) State Government recommendations on DPR/ cost (ii) Corringendum for cost under Section 29(2) of Electricity (Supply) Act, 1948. (iii) Clarifications on tentative financial package.
4.	Rajgarh CCGT (M/s. Alpine Power System Ltd). Madhya Pradesh	343.48	1128.78	(i) Compliance of Section 29 (2) of the Eleiricity (Supply) Act, 1948 corrigendum for revised capacity and cost. report u/s. 29(3) awaited.

s. No.	Name of the project/ Promoters/ 'State	Capacity (MW)	Estimated completed cost (Rs. in crores)	Pending inputs
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
				(ii) State Government consent u/s 18 A for authorisation to revised capacitj'.
				(iii) Power evacuation system and number of outlets in styard.
				(iv) Re\alidated fuel transport clearance.
				(A-) Fuel linkage for revised capacity'of 343.48 MW.
5.	Jhabua CCGT (M/s Kedia Power Ltd.) Madhya Pradesh	360	1365.768	(i) Compliance of Section 29(2) of Electricity (Supply)
				(ii) Act. 1948 corrigendum for revised capacit\' and cost:
				(iii) report u/s 29(3) from State
				(IV) Government awaited. State Go\'ernment consent u/s 18A for re\ised capacity'.
				MoEF and SPCB clearance for submergence of 194.33 Ha of land.
				Fresh approval from Government of Madhya Pradesh for drawal of 8.63 cu. m. of consumptive water.
6.	Hassan CCP (M/s. Hassan Power Supply Co. Ltd) Karnataka	189	715.62	(i) Reduction of hard cost by the promoters.
				(ii) Resolution of water availablity by CWC from inter-State angle (CWDT issue).

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
7.	Nanjangud CCPP (T) (M/s. IPS Power Co.)	96.7	US $ 52.26 M+Rs. 154.916 crore	(i) Resolution of water availabilit\' by CWC from i inter-State angle (CWDT issue), (ii) Finalisation of hard cost
8.	Mandya CCPP (M/s. Mandya Power Partners Pvt. Ltd.)	164.4	674.77f	(i) Compliance of Section 29(2)- corrigendum for revised capacity and cost in Gazette. (ii) Firmed completed cost, (iii) Water availability (C&S). (iv) Transfer of fiiel linkage in favour of Gen. Co. (v) Fuel transport. (vi) MoEF clearance—revalidation for revised capacity. (vii) Financial package (revised report received on 31-1-2000 is under examination).
9.	Telgi (Bijapur) TPP (M/s. KEI Energy Pvt. Ltd.)	350	1597.7	Considered by SPAC on 16-3-1999. Not recommended for techno-economic clearance as cost is not properly structured and equipment and service costs are not indicated in the reasonable proportion.
10.	Srimushnam Lignite TPP (M/s. TICAPCO)	250	1451	(i) Water availability. (ii) State Government recommendation on DPR and cost.

s. No	Name of the project/ Promoters/ State	Capacity (MW)	Estimated completed cost (Rs crores)	Pending inputs 1. m
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
				(iii) Approval of Ministry of Coal for mining plan.
11.	Krishnapatnam 'A' TPP (M/s. GVK Power Krishnapatnam Ltd.)	520	US$ 377.56 M+Rs. 1089.729 crores	(i) Coal linkage and transportation. (ii) Revalidated MoEF clearance for revised capacity. (iii) Env (SPCB clearance for proposed Jetty). (iv) Revalidated NoC of AAI. (V) CWC clearance.

Rural Electrification below the target

4068. SHRJ SANTOSH BAGRODIA ; Will the Minister of POWER be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Rural Electrification in the country is much below the target:

(b) if so. the reasons for the same, State-wise;

(c) how many villages in the countn,- were provided with electricit\- in the last three years. State-wise; and

(d) what measures are being taken for accelerating the process in the year 2000-2001?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF POWER (SHRIMATI JAYAWANTI MEHTA) : (a) and (b) Out of a total of 587258 inhabited villages as per 1991 census. 506401 \illages have been electrified at the end of Februar}-. 2000. Many of the \'illages remaining for electrification are generally in remote and difficult areas. Some of the major reasons for slow progress are attributable mainly to financial constraints, inadequate sub-distribufion system facilities, disturbed conditions prevailing in some States, non-repayment of dues of Rural Electrification Corporation resuUing in no cash flow, lack of demand from the consumers due to backwardness and poor economic conditions.

(c) and (d) Details villages electrified in the first three > ears of the 9th Plan are given in the statement *(See hdow).* Many of the \ illages remaining for